



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,476	05/17/2005	Andrea Bragagnini	007511.00003	3939
22907 7590 08/31/2010 BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051				
EXAMINER				
ROCHE, JOHN B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2184				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/31/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/535,476

Applicant(s)

BRAGAGNINI ET AL.

Examiner

JOHN B. ROCHE

Art Unit

2184

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-9 and 11-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-9 and 11-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leger et al. (US 5,781,799), hereafter referred to as Leger'799 in view of Walker et al. (US 2003/0033454), hereafter referred to as Walker'454 and Greene (US 6,870,929), hereafter referred to as Greene'929.

Referring to claim 1, Leger'799 teaches a method of exchanging data within a direct memory access arrangement including a plurality of IP blocks (plurality of communication sources such as disk controllers, SCSI controllers, parallel data ports, LANs and WANs, column 4, lines 7-9), the method comprising the steps of: associating with said IP blocks respective DMA modules (DMA controllers 20 each with multiple channels as seen in figure 1 and column 4, lines 2-3); and

coupling said respective DMA modules over a data transfer facility in a chain arrangement (DMA controllers 20 in a daisy chain as seen in figure 2 and column 4, lines 38-39).

Leger'799 does not appear to explicitly teach said DMA modules each including an input buffer and an output buffer; the chain wherein each DMA module, other than the last in the chain, has its respective output buffers coupled to the input buffer of another of said DMA modules downstream in the chain and each of said DMA modules, other than the first in the chain, has its respective input buffer coupled to the output buffer of another of said DMA modules upstream in the chain; causing each of said DMA modules to interact with the respective IP block by writing data from the input buffer of the DMA module into the respective IP block and reading data from the respective IP block into the output buffer of the DMA module; and operating said input and output buffers in such a way that: said writing of data from the input buffer of the DMA module into the respective IP block is started when the respective input buffer is at least partly filled with data, and when said reading of data from the respective IP block into the output buffer of the DMA module is completed, the data in the output buffer of the DMA module are transferred to the input buffer of the DMA module downstream in the chain or, in the case of the last DMA module in the chain,

are provided as output data; controlling transfer of data between said coupled buffers over said data transfer facility by: issuing at least one request of a requesting buffer for a buffer coupled therewith to indicate at least one transfer condition selected out of the group consisting of: data existing to be transferred and enough space existing for receiving said data when transferred; issuing at least one corresponding acknowledgement towards said requesting buffer confirming that the said at least one transfer condition is met; and transferring data between said requesting buffer and said coupled buffer, whereby said data transfer facility is left free between said at least one request and said at least one acknowledgement.

However, Walker'454 teaches each DMA module including an input buffer (data is buffered internally between read and write operations, paragraph 4, lines 6-7) and an output buffer (data is buffered internally between read and write operations, paragraph 4, lines 6-7); causing each of said DMA modules to interact with the respective IP block by writing data from the input buffer of the DMA module into the respective IP block (writing data to destination, paragraph 4, line 3) and reading data from the respective IP block into the output buffer of the DMA module (reading data from source, paragraph 4, line 2); and

operating said input and output buffers in such a way that: said writing of data from the input buffer of the DMA module into the respective IP block is started when the respective input buffer is at least partly filled with data (it is inherent to the invention that the buffer be at least partly filled with data while writing into the IP block); and when said reading of data from the respective IP block into the output buffer of the DMA module is completed, the data in the output buffer of the DMA module are transferred to the input buffer of the DMA module downstream in the chain (couple port A to port B, paragraph 30, line 8) or, in the case of the last DMA module in the chain, are provided as output data (ports coupled to other locations, paragraph 24, lines 1-2); and controlling transfer of data between said coupled buffers over said data transfer facility by: issuing at least one request of a requesting buffer for a buffer coupled therewith to indicate at least one transfer condition selected out of the group consisting of: data existing to be transferred and enough space existing for receiving said data when transferred (DMA modules cannot function properly unless there is a method to confirm that data exists to be transferred and/or enough space exists for receiving the transferred data); issuing at least one corresponding acknowledgement towards said requesting buffer confirming that

the said at least one transfer condition is met (bit 8 in transfer size configuration register set to 1, paragraph 37, line 1); and transferring data between said requesting buffer and said coupled buffer (transfer process initiated, paragraph 37, line 2), whereby said data transfer facility is left free between said at least one request and said at least one acknowledgement (read requests can still be made despite busy memory/module, paragraph 38, lines 23-25).

Leger'799 and Walker'454 are analogous art because they are both drawn to the field of direct memory access.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Leger'799 and Walker'454 before him or her, to modify the method of Leger'799 to incorporate the features of Walker'454 because the addition of an input buffer and an output buffer can facilitate coupling between two DMA modules.

The motivation for doing so would have been to mitigate the typical disadvantage of conventional DMA controllers, wherein said conventional DMA controller acquires complete control of a bus (paragraph 5, lines 1-4; paragraph 6, lines 1-3).

Further, Greene'929 teaches the chain wherein each module, other than the last in the chain, has its respective output buffers coupled to the input buffer of another of said DMA

modules downstream in the chain and each of said DMA modules, other than the first in the chain, has its respective input buffer coupled to the output buffer of another of said modules upstream in the chain (combinational sections 804-1 to 804-n and pipeline registers 806-1 to 806-n are parts of each clocked cipher stage 802-1 to 802-n as seen in figure 8 and column 2, lines 10-13; figure 8 shows the pipeline registers 806-1 to 806-2 connected to the combinational sections 804-2 to 804-n respectively); and associating with said input buffers coupled in the chain at least one intermediate block to control data transfer between said coupled buffers (scheduler 106 controls the order in which data is processed as seen in figure 1 and column 5, lines 32-33).

Greene'929 is analogous to Leger'799 and Walker'454 because they are both drawn to the inventive field of data processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Greene'929, Leger'799 and Walker'454 before him or her, to modify the data-exchanging method of Leger'799 and Walker'454 to include the combinational sections and pipeline registers of Greene'929 because the chain of combinational sections and pipeline registers can enhance the overall performance of the data processing and transfer.

The motivation for combining these teachings would have been to provide a higher throughput (column 2, lines 42-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Greene'929 with Leger'799 and Walker'454 to bring about the invention as claimed above.

Note that claim 9 contains the corresponding limitations of claim 1 as shown above; therefore, it is rejected using the same reasoning accordingly.

As to claim 3, Walker'454 teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of: including a CPU in the arrangement (processor 7, paragraph 33, line 1); using said CPU for transferring data to be processed into the input buffer of the first DMA module in said chain (processor 7 issues a data instruction to DMA controller 5 and writes the source address to the source configuration register, paragraph 33, lines 1-5); and using said CPU for collecting said output data from the output buffer of the last DMA module in said chain (processor 7 issues a data instruction to DMA controller 5 and writes the destination address to the destination configuration register, paragraph 33, lines 1-5).

Note that claims 5, 11 and 14-15 contain the corresponding limitations of claim 3 as shown above; therefore, they are rejected using the same reasoning accordingly.

As to claim 4, Walker'454 teaches the method of claim 3, further comprising the step of: configuring said DMA modules via said CPU (processor 7 issues data transfer instructions containing source address and destination address to DMA controller 5, paragraph 33, lines 1-4).

As to claim 6, Walker'454 teaches the apparatus of claim 5 wherein at least one of said input and output buffers has a fixed data width with respect to said data transfer facility (consistent data width regarding bus transfers is inherent to proper functionality of DMA modules) and a selectively variable data width with respect to said respective IP blocks (variable buffer size parameters bits 4:2 in source and destination configuration registers, paragraph 33, line 10 - paragraph 34).

Note that claim 13 contains the corresponding limitations of claim 6 as shown above; therefore, it is rejected using the same reasoning accordingly.

As to claim 7, Walker'454 teaches the apparatus of claim 5, further comprising: a slave interface module (processor 7, paragraph 33, line 1) configured to read from outside the apparatus data relating to at least one parameter selected from the group consisting of: a parameter indicating how many bits are available in at least one of said input buffers (size of the data block to be transferred, paragraph 36, lines 1-2); a parameter indicating how many bits are present in at least one of said input buffers (destination address register buffer size bits 4:2, paragraph 34); a parameter indicating how many bits are available for reading in at least one of said output buffers (source address bits 31:10, paragraph 33, line 10); and a parameter indicating how many bits are present in at least one of said output buffers (source address register buffer size bits 4:2, paragraph 33, line 10).

As to claim 8, Walker'454 teaches the apparatus of claim 5 further comprising: a reprogrammable finite state machine (state machine 6 as seen in figure 3 and paragraph 31, line 4) configured to drive operation of said apparatus by receiving data from at least one of said input buffers (data is buffered internally between read and write operations, paragraph 4, lines 6-7), downloading data into said respective IP block

corresponding to said at least one of said input buffers (write the data to the destination, paragraph 4, line 3), receiving data from said respective IP block (read the data from the source, paragraph 4, line 2), and storing data in said at least one of said output buffers (data is buffered internally between read and write operations, paragraph 4, lines 6-7).

As to claim 12, Leger'799 and Walker'454 do not teach the apparatus of claim 11, wherein the plurality of DMA modules comprises three DMA modules. However, an apparatus comprising three DMA modules is simply an alternative arrangement in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Leger'799 and Walker'454's system to incorporate, as shown above, the apparatus of claim 11, wherein the plurality of DMA modules comprises three DMA modules. The motivation to combine these teachings is to enable other modules to access the system bus while a DMA controller is handling a transfer between two modules (paragraph 5, lines 2-6).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed June 10, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Referring to independent claim 1, Applicant asserts that Leger cannot be combined with Walker to teach or suggest connecting different DMA connectors together (page 3, line 22 - page 4, line 7).

Examiner respectfully submits that Walker shows that at least one of the ports can be connected to a dedicated module. Further, Leger teaches DMA controllers connected in a daisy-chain configuration. One could reasonably have the initial DMA controller connected to a system bus on one end and to another DMA controller on another.

Further, Applicant asserts that the reasoning for modifying Leger with Walker--that the addition of an input and output buffer would facilitate coupling between two DMA modules--is a circular argument, reasserting that "Walker does not teach or suggest coupling a port of the DMA module" (page 4, lines 8-14).

Examiner respectfully submits that, as argued above, one could have an initial DMA controller connected to a system bus on one end and to another DMA controller on another, and in accordance with Leger, daisy-chain the controllers together in sequence.

Further, Applicant asserts that the motivation to combine is taken from Walker, which Applicant argues does not teach or suggest coupling multiple DMA controllers together (page 4, lines 15-21).

Examiner respectfully submits that, as argued above, one could have an initial DMA controller connected to a system bus on one end and to another DMA controller on another, and in accordance with Leger, daisy-chain the controllers together in sequence.

Further, Applicant argues that the motivation for combining the teachings of Greene with Leger and Walker is not valid, specifically that no valid reason to add encryption to a DMA system in the first place was given (page 5, lines 5-9).

Examiner respectfully submits that the intention of combining Greene with Leger and Walker was not to add encryption to a DMA system, but rather to add pipelined processing to a DMA system.

Applicant also asserts that the previously given motivation for combining cannot be applied to Greene as cited, and that there is nothing in Greene to indicate that the specific elements 802-806 are responsible for making the system faster (page 5, lines 10-17).

Examiner respectfully submits that a better motivation is shown in the rejection above (specifically, that a pipelined arrangement can produce a higher throughput).

Also, Applicant asserts that the addition of an encryption function to the DMA would surely be slower than pure DMA (page 5, lines 18-23).

Examiner respectfully submits that as previously mentioned, the intention of combining Greene with Leger and Walker was not to add encryption to the DMA system, but rather to add pipelined processing to said DMA system.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN B. ROCHE whose telephone number is (571)270-1721. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm, M-F EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Tsai can be reached on 571-272-4176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JR

**/Henry W.H. Tsai/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2184**